

App. Serial No.: 10/614,606  
Atty. Docket No.: P2415

Henneman agreed that the SmartBoards were absolute input devices in as much as they operate as a touch screen, but pointed out that there was no remapping of the SmartBoards. Examiner Pitaro agreed.

The effect of remapping an absolute input device was also discussed. In particular, Mr. Henneman pointed out that if an absolute input device were remapped from one display to an adjacent display, the cursor would not flow naturally from the first screen to the adjacent edge of the second display, as is an objective of Stone. Rather, if an absolute input device were placed on the right edge (for example) of a display and the input device was remapped to a second display, the cursor would jump to a position on the right edge of the second display.

For the foregoing reasons and the reasons set forth below, it was agreed that the present claims are patentable over the prior art of record. Mr. Henneman agreed to file a response setting forth these arguments. Examiner Pitaro agreed to do an updated search and, if no additional prior art is discovered, to allow the pending claims.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-11, 16-26, 31-33, 37-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haken (US 7,124,374) in view of Keller (US 6,842,795) in view of Stone et al (Point Right: Experience with Flexible Input Redirection in Interactive Workspaces). Claims 14-15 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haken (US 7,124,374) in view of Stone et al.

#### Claims 1-11 and 16-26:

Claim 1 recites (in part) "remapping the absolute input device to the other one of the displays." Because none of the cited prior art teach or suggest this element of Claim 1, no prima facie case of obviousness is established with respect to Claim 1.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner's assertion at page 3 of the Office Action that "Haken-Keller fails to particularly point out remapping with an absolute pointing device." In addition, as set forth above in the interview summary, it is agreed that Stone does not teach or suggest "remapping the absolute input device to the other one of the displays," at least in a manner that is combinable with Haken and/or Keller.

App. Serial No.: 10/614,606  
Atty. Docket No.: P2415

Although Stone is somewhat lacking in implementing details, it is clear that Stone does not disclose the remapping of an absolute pointing device to achieve Stone's stated objective. As discussed in the interview, the objective of Stone is to provide continuous cursor movement across borders between adjacent displays. Stone describes this objective as follows:

To solve this problem, we designed PointRight to allow pointer control from any input device to be re-directed from screen to screen as if all the screens were a large virtual desktop, despite their being driven by different machines. The result is a cursor that the user moves seamlessly across the space of displays as though they were a single surface – when it reaches the edge of a screen, it continues its motion onto the connecting edge of the adjacent screen in that direction. Stone, Page 2, 3<sup>rd</sup> full paragraph.

Remapping an absolute pointing device would not provide the seamless movement required by Stone. For example, assume that are two displays positioned side-by-side and an absolute input device is indicating a position on the right edge of the left display. The cursor would also be positioned on the right edge of the left display. If the input device is then remapped to the display on the right, the cursor would jump from the right edge of the left display all the way over to the right edge of the right display. The cursor would not "continue its motion onto the connecting edge of the adjacent screen," as described by Stone. Thus, it is clear that Stone is not describing the remapping of an absolute input device to a second display.

Claims 2-11 and 16-26 depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 1 and are distinguished, therefore, from the cited prior art for at least the reasons provided above with respect to Claim 1.

Claims 31-33 and 37:

Previously presented Claim 31 recites (in part) "a position field containing data representing a position for triggering a process for remapping an absolute input device to another display." For at least the same reasons provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that no prima facie case of obviousness is established with respect to Claim 31. Claims 32-33 and 37 depend directly from Claim 31 and are, therefore, distinguished from the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as Claim 31.

App. Serial No.: 10/614,606  
Atty. Docket No.: P2415

Claim 38

Original Claim 38 recites (in part) "a remapper responsive to output from said position monitor, and operative to automatically remap the position monitor from one of the displays to another one of the displays." Therefore, for the same reasons provided above with respect to Claim 1, no prima facie case of obviousness is established with respect to Claim 38.

Claim 39

Previously presented Claim 39 recites (in part) "means for automatically remapping the absolute input device from one of the displays to another one of the displays." Therefore, for the same reasons provided above with respect to Claim 1, no prima facie case of obviousness is established with respect to Claim 39.

Claims 40 and 41

Previously presented Claim 40 recites (in part) the step of "automatically remapping the absolute input device to a second display." Therefore, for the same reasons provided above with respect to Claim 1, no prima facie case of obviousness is established with respect to Claim 40. Claim 41 depends directly from Claim 40 and is, therefore, distinguished from the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as Claim 40.

Claims 42-45

As previously presented, Claim 42 recites (in part) "wherein said data contained in said second field is further indicative of a location for triggering a process for remapping an absolute input device between said second display and said particular display." Therefore, for the same reasons provided above with respect to Claim 1, no prima facie case of obviousness can be established with respect to Claim 42. Claims 43-45 depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 42 and are, therefore, distinguished from the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as Claim 42.

App. Serial No.: 10/614,606  
Atty. Docket No.: P2415

Claims 14-15 and 29-30

Claims 14-15 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Haken in view of Stone.

For the reasons provided above with respect to Claim 1, neither Haken nor Stone teach or suggest the step of "remapping the absolute input device to the other one of the displays," as recited by Claim 1. Therefore, because the cited prior art does not teach or suggest all the elements of Claim 1, no prima facie case of obviousness is established with respect to Claim 1. Claims 14-15 and 29-30 depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 1 and are distinguished from the cited prior art for at least the reasons provided above with respect to Claim 1.

Claims 12-13, 27-28, 34-36

Claims 12,13,27,28,34,35,36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Haken in view of Keller in view of Stone in view of Numazaki.

Claims 12-13, 27-28

For the reasons provided above with respect to Claim 1, neither Haken, Keller, nor Stone teach or suggest the step of "remapping the absolute input device to the other one of the displays," as recited by Claim 1. Similarly, Numazaki also does not teach or suggest such a step. Therefore, because the cited prior art does not teach or suggest all the elements of Claim 1, no prima facie case of obviousness is established with respect to Claim 1. Claims 12-13 and 27-28 depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 1 and are distinguished from the cited prior art for at least the reasons provided above with respect to Claim 1.

Claims 34-36

For the reasons provided above with respect to Claim 31, neither Haken, Keller, nor Stone teach or suggest a data structure containing "a position field containing data representing a position for triggering a process for remapping an absolute input device to another display," as recited by Claim 31. Similarly, Numazaki also does not teach or suggest such a data structure. Therefore, because the cited prior art does not teach or suggest all the elements of Claim 31, no prima facie case of obviousness is established with respect to Claim 31. Claims 34-36 depend

App. Serial No.: 10/614,606

Atty. Docket No.: P2415

AUG 20 2009


either directly or indirectly from Claim 31 and are distinguished from the cited prior art for at least the reasons provided above with respect to Claim 31.

For the above reasons Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicant appreciates Examiner Pitaro's time spent preparing for and participating in the interview summarized above. For at least the reasons set forth herein, Applicant believes that Claims 1-45 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner undertake any action other than allowance of Claims 1-45, or if the Examiner has any questions or suggestions for expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's attorney at (269) 279-8820.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/20/09

  
Larry E. Henneman, Jr., Reg. No. 41,063  
Attorney for Applicant  
Henneman & Associates, PLC  
70 N. Main St.  
Three Rivers, MI 49093

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8(a))**

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted via facsimile, on the date shown below, to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, at (571) 273-8300.

Date: 8/20/09

  
Larry E. Henneman, Jr.